

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kashimoto* (U.S. Patent No. 5,844,645) in view of *Yamauchi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,745,202).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

No changes to the claims have been proposed by this response. Claims 1-20 remain currently pending with claims 1-4 under consideration.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kashimoto* in view of *Yamauchi et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Kashimoto* and *Yamauchi et al.*, whether taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 1. For instance, it is respectfully submitted that *Kashimoto* and *Yamauchi et al.*, whether taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in claim 1 including at least “a pad region along a periphery of the active region and along a corresponding region of the second substrate, wherein at least one of gate and data lines extends to the pad region” and “a light-shielding layer in the pad and active regions except the sealing region on the second substrate.”

The Final Office Action fails to address Applicants’ arguments, as previously presented in Amendment filed on February 10, 2004, emphasizing that neither *Kashimoto* nor *Yamauchi et al.* teaches or suggests the feature of a light shielding layer in a pad region, as set forth in Applicants’ claimed combination

The Final Office Action acknowledges that *Kashimoto* does not disclose a light shielding

layer in a pad region and recognizes that *Kashimoto* does not show a pad region. See paragraph 2, lines 8-9 and 21 of the Final Office Action. Thus, the Final Office Action cites *Yamauchi et al.* as allegedly remedying the deficiencies of *Kashimoto* in these regards. In particular, the Final Office Action asserts at page 3, lines 7-11 that “Yamauchi teaches the use of a light member formed to protect external driving circuit (IC) from extraneous light...it would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ a light-shielding member in the pad region for protecting external driving circuit (IC) from extraneous light.”

However, Applicants’ claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “a pad region...wherein at least one of gate and data lines extends to the pad region” and “a light-shielding layer in the pad and active regions.” Thus, the Amendment filed on February 10, 2004 presented arguments emphasizing, *inter alia*, that neither *Kashimoto* nor *Yamauchi et al.* teaches or suggests the feature of a light shielding layer in a pad region, as set forth in Applicants’ claimed combination.

In contrast to Applicants’ claimed combination, as a whole, *Yamauchi et al.* does not disclose a light-shielding member in a pad region. Instead, *Yamauchi et al.* discloses a light interceptive member (10, 11 or 12) surrounding IC (130 or 140). See, for example, FIG. 4 of *Yamauchi et al.* That is, *Yamauchi et al.*’s IC (130 or 140) is formed on “an IC element side.” Column 6, line 43 of *Yamauchi et al.* In fact, *Yamauchi et al.*’s light interceptive member (10, 11 or 12) is formed on a region of an upper substrate that does not overlap a lower substrate and does not have a gate/data line formed thereon. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching or suggestion for considering *Yamauchi et al.*’s light interceptive member on the IC element side as Applicants’ claimed combination including at least the light-shielding layer in the pad region, as asserted by the Final Office Action.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that *Kashimoto* and *Yamauchi et al.*,

whether taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in claim 1 including at least “a pad region along a periphery of the active region and along a corresponding region of the second substrate, wherein at least one of gate and data lines extends to the pad region” and “a light-shielding layer in the pad and active regions except the sealing region on the second substrate.” Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that since *Kashimoto* and *Yamauchi et al.*, whether taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every feature of independent claim 1, *Kashimoto* in view of *Yamauchi et al.* does not render claim 1 unpatentable.

The Final Office Action overlooks Applicants’ traversal of the Office’s assertion that the use of UV-type hardening material for the sealing element is common and well known

Further, at least since claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that *Kashimoto* in view of *Yamauchi et al.* also does not render claims 2-4 unpatentable. In addition, these applied references also fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 2-4. For instance, Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Kashimoto* nor *Yamauchi et al.* teaches or suggests the UV hardening sealant, as set forth in claim 2. The Final Office Action states that UV-type hardening material used for the sealing element is common and known in the liquid crystal display art. See page 3, lines 1-2 of the Final Office Action.

The Final Office Action asserts at page 4, lines 5-6 that “Applicant has not challenged that the use of UV-type hardening material for the sealing element is not common and known in the liquid crystal display art.” However, as stated in the Amendment filed on February 10, 2004, for example, at page 6, lines 7-10, “Applicants respectfully traverse the Office Action’s assertion and request that evidence be provided in accordance with M.P.E.P. §2144.03. In fact, Applicants respectfully submit that thermo-hardening material and not UV hardening sealant is generally

used for the sealing element in the liquid crystal display art.”

In any event, Applicants, once again, respectfully traverse and respectfully challenge the Final Office Action’s assertion of the use of UV-type hardening material for the sealing element as common and known in the liquid crystal display art and respectfully request that evidence be provided in accordance with M.P.E.P. §2144.03 if the rejections are to be maintained.

In light of the above, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should there remain any questions or comments regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: July 19, 2004

By: 
Victoria D. Hao
Registration No. 47,630

Customer No.: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.739.3000
Facsimile: 202.739.3001